

E

301

.S76



Spermacet for inward
bruises with prescription
from the saddle-bags of
Mrs. Franklin and Jefferson...

Sy -



Class E 3 . C 1

Book . S 7 6

SPERMACETI

FOR INWARD USES,

WITH PRESCRIPTIONS

FROM THE SADDLE-BAGS

OF

DRS. FRANKLIN AND JEFFERSON,

REVISED AND AMENDED

FOR THE USE OF

MODERN POLITICO, THEOLOGICO, VALETUDINARIANS.

"No shaking
While taking—
Once took
It can't be shook."

SYRACUSE:

PRINTED AT THE JOURNAL OFFICE

1851.



62791
'05

"They that are whole have no need of the Physician—but they that are sick."

"Shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfil the Law, reprove that which is by circumcision, if it transgress the Law?"

In considering the developement of human intelligence, in its different spheres of activity, from its infancy to the present day, there will be discovered a great fundamental principle or law, to which it is subjected, by an invariable necessity, and which is established by rational proof deriv'd from a knowledge of our organization, as well as from an attentive examination of the past history of the human family. This principle or law is thus briefly declared: "Every principal conception of man, in every branch of knowledge, passes successively through three different stages of theory—the first of which is the theological or fictitious stage; the second, the metaphysical or abstract; the third, the scientific or positive stage." In other words, the human mind naturally employs, in all its researches, three successive methods of philosophy, each radically opposed to the other in its essential character, the first of which methods is the theological; the second the metaphysical, and the third the positive or scientific method. Hence we have derived three distinct systems of conception, upon all subjects of human knowledge, which mutually destroy each other. The first is the necessary starting point of human intelligence; the second the transition stage, and the third the aim and end of human inquiry, the positive state of fixed facts, the only true philosophy.

In the theological state, the human mind, directing its researches towards the internal nature of existence, the first and final causes of the effects with which it is astonished, in one word, toward the absolute truth, imagines these effects to be produced by the direct action and continued agency of supernatural beings, more or less numerous, whose arbitrary intervention explains all the apparent anomalies of the universe.

In the metaphysical state, which is in reality a mere modification of the theological state, the supernatural agents are re-placed, by abstract personifications of realities, inherent in the various existences of the world, who are conceived capable of generating of themselves, all observed phenomena.

Thirdly and lastly, in the positive state, the human mind, convinced of the impossibility of ascertaining absolute truth, ceases to investigate the origin and destiny of the universe, as well as the final cause of effects, in order to devote itself exclusively, by combining reason with observation, to the discovery of the laws of effect, and their invariable relations of succession and similitude, of *relative* and not of absolute truth.

As the theological system rises to its highest possible state of perfection, when it substitutes the dominion of one supreme agent, for the activity of numerous independent divinities who were at first imagined—so the metaphysical system attains its acme when it conceives, in the place of different particular entities, a grand, sole, general entity, styled *Nature*, as the source and cause of all things, while the perfection of the positive system, not yet attained, but gradually and constantly approaching, would consist in the power of demonstrating all observable phenomena, as particular cases of a sole, general fact, such for instance as gravitation.

It would detain us too long to furnish all the proof at command to demonstrate this fundamental law of the human mind. A rapid glance at the most obvious facts will suffice. To all who are acquainted with the general his-

tory of the sciences, the existence of this law will need but little effort to prove. There is no one of the sciences, now arrived at the positive state, which is not known to have been formerly essentially composed of metaphysical abstractions; and if we trace them back to their infantile state, we find them under the dominion of purely theological conceptions, and we have unfortunately but too strong evidence of the traces of these exploded theories in the philosophy of the schools of the present day.

This general revolution of the human mind, can be furthermore manifested, by considering the intellectual developement of the individual mind, as well as that of the race. The starting point of the education of both, being necessarily the same, the different principal phases of the one, will represent the fundamental epochs of the other. Now, does not each one of us, in contemplating his own secret history, remember that he has been a Theologian in his infancy, a metaphysician in his youth; and is it not true to a proverb that man ought to be, if he is not, a physician at forty?

But aside from observation, general or individual, the existence of this fundamental law of the human mind is evident, from the absolute necessities of the mind, in a state of infancy, prior to observation. Since the time of Bacon, all admit that there is no real knowledge, save that which is derived from observed facts. Incontestible as this maxim is, when applied to man in his maturity, it is equally true, that man in his infancy neither did or could thus reason—he *had no facts observed*. Now, if, on the one hand, all positive theory should be founded on observation, it is equally true on the other, that in order to observe, it is necessary for the mind to frame some theory—for if in contemplating facts, we do not immediately attach them to some principle or theory, it will not only be impossible to combine these isolated observations in order to reason from them, but we cannot even retain them; and oftentimes the facts will remain unperceived under our very eyes.

Thus cornered between the necessity of observing, in order to frame some real theory, and the necessity, no less imperious, of framing some sort of a theory in order to observe, the human mind, at its birth, finds itself without escape, except by the natural and lucky conception of the Theological Theory, which offered a rallying point for its efforts and furnished aliment for its activity. Such is, independent of important social considerations, hereafter alluded to, the fundamental proof, which demonstrates the absolute necessity of the purely theological character of primitive philosophy.

This necessity becomes still more obvious, if we consider the perfect harmony of the Theological philosophy with the nature of researches upon which the human mind in its infancy, concentrates all its activity. It is indeed remarkable that the very questions most inaccessible to human reason, the nature of existences, the origin and end of phenomena, are precisely those which our feeble intelligence first grasps, while it entirely overlooks the more attainable and useful problems, as unworthy of consideration. The reason of this is apparent: for it is experience alone that furnishes us with the measure of our understanding, and if man had not commenced with an exaggerated opinion of its power, it would never have acquired the development of which it is susceptible. Such is the law of our organization.

This necessity for theological theory, is furthermore apparent from the consideration, in a practical point of view, of the nature of the researches, which occupied the human mind in its primitive state. In this light, they offer to man the attraction so dear to the heart of man, of unlimited empire over the external world, as destined to his entire use, and presenting in all its phenomena, intimate and eternal relations with our existence. Now, these chimera hopes, these exaggerated ideas of the importance of man in the universe, born in the darkness of theological philosophy, and dying with the first

ray of light emanating from the dawn of positive philosophy, are, in their origin, an indispensable stimulant, without which we cannot conceive how the human mind could have determined to encounter trial and travail of mind or body.

We are at this day so far removed from these youthful visions, at least in regard to most phenomena, that it is difficult for us to recall a realizing sense of the power and necessity of such considerations. Human Reason is now sufficiently mature to enable us to undertake laborious researches in science, without having in view any imaginary purpose, such as agitated the Astrologers and Alchemists. Our intellectual activity is sufficiently excited by the pure hope of discovering the laws of phenomena, by the simple desire of affirming or disaffirming a theory. But it could not have been thus in the infancy of human mind, without the attractive chimeras of Astrology, without the powerful deceptions of alchemy, for example, whence would we have derived, the consistency and the ardor necessary to collect the long series of observations and experiments, which in a later age, served as a foundation for the first positive theories of each of these classes of phenomena? This condition of our mental development was long ago sensibly felt by Kepler in astronomy, and justly appreciated in our own times by Berthollet in chemistry.

From these considerations, we learn, that if positive philosophy is the true end and aim of human intelligence, toward which it has been always tending, it was nevertheless necessary that it should employ, during a long period of time, theological philosophy, as the only possible means or method of development—adapted by its instinctive character to our nascent reason, as naturally as mothers milk for babes.

It will now be easy to conceive that in order to pass from this elementary philosophy to the positive method, the human mind must necessarily adopt as a connecting link, the metaphysical method. This last consideration is necessary to complete the series. We perceive, without difficulty, that our understanding advancing only by imperceptible degrees, could not leap, without intermediate steps, from the theological to the positive philosophy. Theology and positive science are so profoundly incompatible; their conceptions have a character so radically opposite, that before renouncing the one to employ the other, human intelligence must necessarily use some intermediate conceptions, of a mixed character, adapted, by their very mixture, to produce the gradual transition. Such is the natural destiny of Metaphysics; they have no other real value. Man, by substituting for a controlling supernatural agent, one of a corresponding and inseparable nature, (although the latter was originally conceived a mere emanation of the former,) began to confine his attention to facts alone:—the notions in regard to these metaphysical agents having been subtilised to such a degree, as to become, in the opinion of correct thinkers and men of sense, mere abstractions of existing phenomena. It is impossible to conceive, by what other proceeding our understanding could have arisen from supernatural to purely natural considerations—from the theological to the positively true philosophy.

Having thus established, as far as in me lies, (without entering into a detailed discussion, which I do not design at present, but defer to some future day,) the general principle of the development of the Human mind, it will now be easy to determine the precise nature of the positive philosophy.

We have seen that the basis of this philosophy is to regard all phenomena as subjected to natural invariable laws, whose discovery and reduction to the least possible number is the object, aim and end of all positively true philosophy, which rejects as absolutely inaccessible and senseless all researches into so called *causes*, either *first* or *final*. It is useless to insist upon a principle so familiar to all who have the least pretensions to science or com-

mon sense. Every body knows that we never pretend to explain the generic causes of phenomena, (since we only remove the difficulty a single step,) but merely analyse the circumstances of their production, and connect them by normal relations of succession and similitude. No man of sense, at the present day, pretends to look any farther.

Such being the nature of the positively true philosophy, let us inquire how far it has been perfected and what remains to complete it.

It is difficult to fix the precise era of the origin of this revolutionary movement of the human mind, because like all other great events, it is and has been in a constant state of accomplishment, particularly since the labors of Aristotle and of the Alexandrine school. However, in order to prevent vague ideas, it may be safely assumed that the era of Bacon, Descartes and Galileo, say two centuries ago, was the period of time when the true philosophy arose in opposition to the Theology and Metaphysics of antiquity. From this memorable epoch the rise and progress of true philosophy and the decline and fall of Theologico-Metaphysics is evident; and the simple question arises, whether the conquest of the former over the latter is complete? The answer must be in the negative—and there remains consequently a great work to be done, in order to perfect that conquest. To the four principal categories of positive astronomy, physics, chemistry and physiology; thence remains to be added that of *Sociology*, as a fifth. The theological and metaphysical methods, rejected by the four first, are still employed in the latter, although all men of sense are sick and tired of the vain and interminable contests arising between *Divine Right* and the *sovereignty of the People*. This is the crying evil of the day. This is the Gordian knot—shall it be loosed or cut?

“What? to strike? to slay?

No! Not unless the audible voice of Heaven

Call thee to that dire office; but to shed

On ears abused by falsehood, truths of power,

In words immortal—not such words as flash

From the fierce demagogue's unthinking rage,

To madden for a moment and expire—

Nor such as the rapt orator imbues

With warmth of facile sympathy, and moulds

To grace the noble favor of an hour—

But words which bear the spirit of great deeds

Winged for the Future.”

The positive system, since the days of Bacon, has obtained such an ascendancy over the minds of men who still remain unconscious of its influence, that theologians and metaphysicians can only hope to check the decline and fall of their doomed systems, by attempting to base them on the observation of facts. To this end, they have imagined, in these latter times, a distinction between exterior and interior observation, the latter of which is dedicated to the solution of intellectual or mental phenomena. This is not the place to discuss this sophism. I shall merely allude to the principal consideration which proves clearly that this pretended direct contemplation of the mind by itself, is a pure illusion. It was believed, a short time ago, that vision was explained by saying that the luminous action of bodies defined upon the retina, a picture representing exterior forms and colors. To this idea, the physiologists object with reason, that if the action of luminous impressions was similar to that of images, a third eye was necessary in order to see them. Is it not equally so in this case of interior observation?

It is evident that the human mind, by an invincible necessity, can observe all phenomena save its own—for by whom shall the observation be made? The observed and the observer being identical, how can the observation take place? Now, let us examine the *modus operandi* of this proceeding. *Imprimis* you are to isolate yourself as much as possible from all exterior sen-

sation—intellectual effort is expressly forbidden. In the second place, after having attained to this perfect state of mental torpor, you must occupy yourself in contemplating the operations of your mind, while in its torpid state; ascertain what your mind is doing when it does nothing! Where is Moliere? What mysterious rapping! What wonder that many men have many minds, and that the numbers of each are equal, upon such mysticisms. What valuable discovery has ever been made by interior observation, or inspiration? either in physical or moral science? Can one be named?

The first great result of positive philosophy will be the manifestation by experience of the laws of our intellectual functions, and consequently a precise knowledge of the general rules essential to the attainment of Truth, without the possibility of mistake.

A second consequence, no less important, and of much more pressing necessity, is the reorganization of our system of education. There is but one opinion among sensible men, as to the necessity of revolutionising our educational system, which remains essentially theological, metaphysical and literary, by a substitution of a positive education, in harmony with the spirit of the age and adapted to the wants of modern civilization. We need a fundamental regeneration of the general system of education, from the primary school to the last finishing touches of a sound and perfect accomplishment. The insatiable thirst for useful knowledge, the eagerness for popular lectures upon scientific subjects, the neglect and contempt of the theological and metaphysical and even literary productions of the age, all point with unmistakable significance to the absolute and immediate necessity of revolution in our system of education. Our children are crying for bread; shall we continue to give them stones? have we not had enough of this hard feed? Look to it Legislators!

Thirdly and lastly, but not leastly, my fellow-citizens and brethren, Positive philosophy is destined to become the only solid basis of the reorganization and regeneration of our Social system—upon which can repose in security the convulsed nations of the civilized world. It would only be wasting time to attempt to prove to you, what it is almost superfluous even to state, that in this country, opinions govern—through the instrumentality of Law, as a means of avoiding anarchy—and that at this moment, there exists in this country a moral and political crisis of opinion refusing the aid of Law, and threatening anarchy as a matter of course. Our present difficulty consists in a profound divergence of opinion upon fundamental maxims upon which our social institutions are based. So long as individual intelligence, do not by unanimous consent adhere to a certain number of general ideas capable of forming a common social doctrine, it cannot be disguised that the state of the nation is essentially and necessarily revolutionary, notwithstanding the existence of temporary political palliatives, operating as a provisional government, and maintaining an outward form of social order for the time being; whilst it is equally certain, that if there be a combination of opinions and principles opposed to the organized political institutions, these institutions must eventually conform to the opinions and principles, sooner or later, by force of opinion or by reason of force. It is to this point that should be directed the attention of all, who feel the importance of the original sources of the power of society. Now, from the point of view upon which the preceding considerations have placed us, we can readily discover the fundamental difficulties of the present crisis, and also their remedy. The difficulty lies in the existence of three incompatible systems of social philosophy—clashing one against the other—the theological—the metaphysical, and the positive systems. If either of these systems possessed in reality, a complete and universal preponderance, there would at least be harmony; it is the co-

existence of the three opposing systems which creates the confusion and chaos of our position. If this be true, then the question is, which of the three shall prevail? for there can be but *one Supreme*. Reduced to these simple terms, the answer appears ready; for it must be evident to the most careless observer, that the positive philosophy is destined to succeed; being *True* it must prevail. "Solitary and alone" it has been progressing for ages; while its antagonists have been at the same time gradually sinking to decay. Deplorable as the fact may be considered, it is nevertheless incontestible: We may lament it, but we cannot destroy it; neither can we neglect it or overlook it, without incurring the penalty of indulging in an illusory speculation.

This general revolution of the human mind is at this moment accomplished, and in this country it is very generally realized, although not as yet positively established or systematised. This is the proper duty of the rising generation—the crisis is at hand—the triumph of positive philosophy will restore order. The decided preference of all heads and of all hearts from the highest to the lowest, for truth and common sense before the vagaries and mysticisms of the pulpit, is a sure presage of the general acclamation with which a free and enlightened People will hail the regeneration of our worn-out social system, now about to be reorganized upon the principle of our political institutions—the basis of the sovereignty of the will of the People.

Theology and metaphysics are struggling against each other for supremacy; and both unite against the positive system, which only interferes to condemn and conquer both—with its success, is identified the cause of Freedom, and Humanity, not only in America but throughout the world.

Having now finished this abstract exposition, which is taken almost literally from the work of the best thinker of modern times, I proceed to take a more practical and popular view of the effects produced upon our political and social institutions by the application of these contending principles.

In moral as in physical science, there are certain first principles or axioms, which are too obvious for demonstration—some of which are equally applicable to both. For example, all must admit, that all natural power (for of the Supernatural or Higher power we can form no idea) must be either stationary or locomotive—and that all motion must be either progressive, retroactive or rotary.

1. Of the progressive principle.

If we consider man in his lowest original state of mental development, we find him, instead of being "little lower than the angels," but little elevated above "the beasts who perish"—a mere eating, drinking, sleeping, propagating, fighting, roaming cannibal brute.

Upon the first step of the scale, rising from the brute, we find him, instead of eating his captive in war, enslaving him as the weaker animal, and reducing him, and the female animal, to a state of slavery and bondage. The master animal thus rises to the warrior state—leaving his captive and his woman to drudge at home. Here then is the first step of human progress—and we find man a warrior and a "mighty hunter"—enslaving the weaker man and woman, himself the slave of his animal nature, and of an imagination, striving in vain to find a cause for the most simple operations of the natural world by which he is surrounded. Conscious of his own weakness of body and mind, he ascribes every effect to an imaginary cause. Terror-struck with the visible operations of the powers of nature, he ascribes their inscrutable causes to the first object which presents itself to his senses. He propitiates these powers for his safety and welfare—he deprecates their wrath by sacrifices, worship, flattery—in one word, he is an idolater—and

stocks and stones and creeping things are his gods,—free in body, but a slave to his untutored, unsubdued imagination—without reason or understanding. This is the first step of progress—but is it not, nevertheless, progress? and does it not shew that this first step was attained by subjecting his fellow being, by force to labor for him? He would not labor himself, any more than any other animal will labor, unless compelled by superior force. No mere savage will labor. Slavery then, slave-labor was the first step of human progress.

We next find this slave-savage, man and woman, gradually learning to labor—which necessarily implies mental as well as bodily labor—for a man who works must think about what he is doing. Hence reason began to dawn by being necessarily compelled into action by brute force or slavery—and from the simplest operation of raising vegetables and fruits he learned agriculture—from building huts he learned architecture—from making up skins for clothing he became a manufacturer—hence labor, slave labor, gradually elevated man from the warrior or hunter state, to the industrial man—habit made labor easy and it became “second nature;” hence man, finding out by experience and reason that it was better to labor than to be idle, continued to labor. He taught his children to labor, and rose from slave-labor to free-labor. Exercise of body and mind, increased the strength of both—and the slave from being the weaker, became the stronger man, and gradually, in the course of time, asserting his natural right of freedom, of which savage force had deprived him, he accomplished his deliverance from slavery, both of body and mind—temporal and spiritual. As reason advanced by means of labor and exercise, imagination receded. He learned that stocks and stones and creeping things had no power—instead of being superior to him he found the reverse to be true—but reason, being yet in its infancy, and imagination consequently strong, he attributed effects to imaginary causes—to Jupiter, Juno, Osiris, &c. Was not here progress?

As numbers increased, and labor began to supply more than the mere animal wants, ideas of property and society arose. Man began to tame animals and kept herds and flocks—he became a shepherd—a roving herdsman—he began to watch the return of the seasons—the rising and setting of the stars—in one word, he became a student of nature—and there arose the idea of a division of labor. These students of nature became astronomers, astrologers, magicians, oracles, priests of the Sun, of Apollo, of Diana, &c. Using their superior power of reason, they enslaved the weaker reasons, by subjecting them to their control. Strong in imagination and credulous, they became the easy dupes of the superior reason—hence hierarchies and spiritual slavery. But the superior reason ruled for good—it taught the inferior and the race progressed. Reason grew in the schools of the hierarchy and was disseminated gradually to the spiritual slaves of their power. Civilization, with rude arts and simple sciences increased—and man began to congregate in villages and cities and *progressed*, slowly emerging from temporal and spiritual bondage as he increased in reason.

In this stage of progress, imagination still governed society—Polytheism, with its temples, its oracles, its flamens, ruling by hereditary and divine right, holding direct and visible communication with invisible and imaginary powers or causes, swayed the destinies of man for centuries.

Socrates, and Cicero, and Plato, at length arise to demonstrate the progress of man from his normal state of cannibalism—and to progress themselves from Polytheism to Monotheism—the idea of the immortality of the soul, foreshadowing the immortality of reason, is born, and gradually eradicated Polytheism. Under Constantine, Catholicism arose with its mighty, world-wide political hierarchy, and as old Rome, enslaved body and mind for

centuries—this was a great step in human progress. By making its hierarchy elective instead of hereditary, it taught the world the secret of mental over mere animal power—the power of mind over matter—and the world, profiting by the lesson, gradually learned to reason—to think—until Galileo appeared and, reasoning with more power than his teachers, taught mankind that the immutable and eternal laws of nature were beyond the control of all special visible and direct interposition from any higher power. Miracles ceased of course—and with them catholicism expired. Men began to confide in this new power of man; they began to question the oracular power of the Church—which Galileo had proved to be not exactly infallible—they became curious to see the oracle itself—they obtained the manuscripts—and free labor having meantime learned to print, they all with one accord began to read the oracle for themselves. Instead of taking it second hand from the sooth-sayers and interpreters of dreams, all became inspired, and the oracle alone was infallible. Was not this progress?

Luther and Calvin and Erasmus were progressive spirits in their day and generation. Galileo had taught them the power and the courage of Truth. He was not afraid of the rack—and Luther defied Christendom. Calvin burned Servetus—but he was still progressive. The thunders of the Vatican had become “*brutum fulmen*”—the lightning had gone out. Henry the 8th was determined to marry Anne Bullen, who was delighted to change her name—and Catharine of Arragon, and the Emperor and the Pope might consent or not as they pleased. Anne Bullen was too much for the Pope's Bull—and Henry the 8th arrogated to himself the incarnation of the Papal Bull. Was not this progress? Did not the temporal power then bid defiance to the Hierarchy? did not Henry establish the Church of England, in subserviency to his Supreme will, uniting in himself the combined power of Church and State—temporal and spiritual. Was he not King and High Priest—enslaving body and soul to the behests of his supreme control?—Was he not the Higher Power? and was not this progress in temporal and spiritual power? Aye, the end of the Progress of the animal and imaginative power of slavery, temporal and spiritual. What more progress could there be? with one foot on the State and the other on the Church, and trampling under foot body and soul of man, why progress? Had not temporal and spiritual slavery risen to its acme? Can it rise further? If it stir must it not go down—culminate? What then must it do? It must stand still. It becomes the *Stationary Power*, combining in itself the elements of the progressive principle, by which it had overcome the spiritual dynasty of Rome—that is the temporal power or state, as well as the church or spiritual power, which was struggling to return to Rome, the old dominion of its past glory, instead of remaining stationary under the temporal despotism of Church and State, in subservience to which it must now act. Hence the spiritual power or church was retrograde in its principle—and these principles, progressive and retrograde, being combined in nearly equal strength produced the stationary power. Then commenced and still continues, the struggling between these powers on the continent and in England, whence sprang the United States.

Hastening over the details of English History, in which is recorded the death struggle of the triangular warfare of these contending principles, and the triumph, after various reverses, of the progressive principle in the downfall of Charles I., and the establishment of the Commonwealth—and without pursuing the continued struggle of this principle to establish itself firmly in power, from that period to the recent repeal of the corn laws of England, the death-knell not only of the stationary principle, now feebly represented by the pageantry of the Crown, but of the Church or retrograde principle,

still struggling to ally itself to its mother of Rome,—let us follow the progressive principle in its path of glory, sighing like the spirit of Alexander for new worlds to conquer. Paying a farewell visit to its continental friends, and taking an affectionate leave of the Faderland, it embarks in the May Flower, lands at Plymouth Rock, and strips to its mighty work. Presbyterians, Covenanters, fifth Monarchy men, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Puritans, Episcopalians and Romanists, all partially released from the retrograde shackles of prelacy, papacy and such erastianisms progressives, all, fly to the promised land of New England. Younger sons of worn out courtiers, the scattered waifs of the wrecked stationary power, with progressive Huguenots from France, are gradually thrown upon the shore from Delaware to Georgia. Quakers go to Pennsylvania—while the slowly, but surely, progressive sons of the Faderland follow in the wake of Hendrick Hudson.

Having shown the existence of the progressive, stationary and retrograde powers, I proceed to demonstrate the existence and effect of the *rotary* power, in Political, Social and Religious institutions. This is a very important power—it combines readily with either of the three demonstrated powers, or it re-acts upon either—it is a kind of a villainous compound of them all, and is usually manifested by a badge of *office*, in staring capitals, or a consequential air which will betray its presence without a badge. It is immaterial which way it works—it has no fixed principle of action, except to revolve on its own axis, and will go any way, if it can only be paid. Its presence as a moving power is unmistakable, and yet it can be more easily imagined than described. *In politics*, its influence is practically, to make time-serving demagogues, who watch the struggle of the contending principles—whose sole aim is to get into the car that is likely to go. The question with them is not so much where shall we go, but *can we go any way*—for go we must; whether it be North or South, East or West is a matter of no moment, if we can only go, (or stand still,) and get paid. Will it pay? We are at the service of either principle.

In social life this principle assumes the practical form of Conventionalism—it conforms to the fashions and customs and etiquette of society—it goes to the tailor, to the mantuamaker, and the milliner for its dress— it goes to the fashionable churches for its religion, its morality, its established usage—it troubles itself little with the politics of the times, which are too positive and progressive for its fastidious taste—it does not inquire very particularly as to what is strictly right or wrong—but as to what is customary—fashionable—and in accordance with received usages and ceremonies. Conform to these outwardly, and you can think and act secretly as you please—but beware how you infringe the Ceremonial Law. You will be ridiculed out of the pale of social life—and ridicule is the severest kind of persecution. There is no tyranny like that of conformity to the fashion of this world.

In Religion, (let me tread lightly upon its grave, for it is consecrated, holy ground,) it endeavors to reconcile God and Mammon—The will of God, with the will of Man—Theocracy, with Democracy—The Bible and the U. S. Constitution—Special interposition of Divine providence with the eternal and immutable laws of nature—in one word, the progressive principle of Human Reason, with the retroactive principle of Imagination, Superstition, and Fanaticisms—Preaching the doctrines of a by-gone and defunct theological system derived from the Bible, the revealed will and infallible oracle of Deity: often in direct conflict with Reason. It endeavors to reconcile the one with the other of these antagonistic principles. It would combine the light of Reason with the darkness of superstition and compromise upon

a dim twilight. The will of God is made subservient to majorities declaring the will of man; and yet the will of God is supreme. The will of man must in certain particulars conform to the will of God, and yet the Law of the land is supreme. Hence two supremes—the will of God, and the Bible—The will of Man, and the Constitution. The retrograde principle strives for the will of God or the Bible, with conscience or with inspired infallibility to interpret, for, by that means, it has for ages ruled and enslaved the human race: and still seeks to recover its lost supremacy. The progressive principle strives for the Constitution, or the will of man, for by that means, man has escaped from spiritual bondage and its necessary concomitant, temporal and personal bondage. Reason and Revelation are at swords points. The rotary principle strives to reconcile, to compromise, to pour oil upon the troubled waters and quiet them into a temporary superficial calm upon which their frail theological barks may ride in safety. But the ground swell is heaving from the bottom—it may not be, Progress is mighty and must prevail. Ye cannot, upon your own principles, serve God and mammon,—the idols of your imagination—let them both succumb to the Dominion of the Supreme Law of Truth. Before the will of God, can be assumed as a rule of conduct, it is necessary to prove the existence of God, the fact that this bible is his revealed will, and that the interpretation thereof is in accordance with the letter and spirit of the revealed will. Have either of these dogmas ever been proved? can they ever be proved? are they not expressly contradicted by Reason? These are mighty questions, which must be solved. Reason has solved them. The Jehovah of the Jew, the Osiris of the Egyptian, the Jupiter of the Roman, and the Triune God of the Christian are in the eye of Reason equally creatures of an imagination, which Reason has gradually and successively, in its progress of triumph, exterminated from the mind of man. The idea of God is utterly incomprehensible to Human Reason; and can only be proved by appealing to the Bible, or Revelation. Is then the Bible the revealed will of a God, proving his own existence?—Must you not prove his existence extraneously? Has that, can that ever be proved? No! Theologians themselves admit it. You must *assume* the Bible as the infallible word of God, or you cannot prove God. Is this Reason? is this Truth? But what evidence is there of the dogma, that the Bible is the revealed will of God? Internal? or External? Read the Bible—read Genesis—is that the revealed will of an intelligent, moral, just, righteous God?

There is no internal evidence, derived either from a scientific, historical, poetical, or moral aspect of the old or new testament, entitling it to its high pretensions of Omniscient origin, except, perhaps, in its poetry. The Bible is not even on a par with the intelligence of the Augustan age; and Homer and Virgil contain passages of sublimity that may vie with the best specimens of the sacred muse. As to the *prophecies*, I will not condescend to argue. Let those who understand them, explain them, with the book of Revelations. I give it up.

Is the Jehovah of Genesis the God of your worship? Can you abide his morals, his politics or his religion? But aside from all other considerations, *can* the existence of God be proved by the *Bible*? Certainly not—no intelligent man can or does pretend so monstrous an absurdity—no internal evidence, no matter what its amount can prove it—it is inadmissible. You cannot prove the fact of existence from the will of God, because in so doing you pre-suppose the existence of God, which is the very fact to be proved: hence all direct internal evidence, fails. And when we come to the indirect internal evidence, no sane man can believe that the Jehovah of the Jew, and the God of the Christian is the same—and hence the

inference is reasonable that the whole book is fabulous allegorical and utterly unworthy the importance, factitious and fictitious, which it occupies in the civilized world. It is a relic of barbarous infantile puerilities—the nursery rhymes of the race. The miserable attempt of Paley to prove a Deity by the story of the watch, is an admitted failure. A savage finding a watch, unless he had previously known that man could make a watch, would naturally infer that the Great Spirit made it—as witness the fact, one of 1000 that the savage of Lake Erie when he first saw the steamboat coming up Detroit River, exclaimed that it was the Great Spirit. So man when he sees the sun and moon and stars and all the firmament on high, exclaims it is God who made the world—and the Bible account of the manner in which he proceeded to make it, shews incontrovertibly that it is the work of man's imagination, and not of God. The account of the creation of matter and of man, contained in Genesis, not only contradicts itself, but it is contradicted by all human experience—and it is vain that the rotary power persists in its attempt to reconcile it with reason: blind faith is the only basis upon which it rests. The existence of the Great Spirit is *assumed*, and then human reason is bewildered in endeavoring to reconcile the inevitable confusion arising from the conflict not only between Reason and Revelation, but between the conflicting interpretations themselves: hence, wars, and bloodshed, and strife, and ignorance, poverty, crime, and “all the ill that flesh is heir to.” Abolish the blind faith which enslaves reason, and man rises at once to the dignity of his nature. If he cannot as yet, by reason, solve the problem of existence, he has at least proved the utter falsity of the Mosaic fable: and faith instead of aiding him, only dazzles to bewilder and destroy. Reason has discovered enough to justify the expectation, that in the progressive spirit of the march of science and knowledge, she will yet discover the great secret of nature: and meantime do not let us retard and keep back reason, by the retrograde principle of adhering to consecrated error and time-honored delusions; they are fast fading away—the dark ages are past, and the dawn of Reason, that day-spring from on high, is ushering in a glorious age of intelligence for unborn millions.

Granted we have elegant Church edifices, and that multitudes flock to them. Grant the outward and visible form, but where is the inward and spiritual grace? the essential vitality of metaphysical theology? Granted the people go to Church, but *why* do they go? Strip the Church of the adventitious bolsterings of fancy and sensitive feelings, and who would fill its pews? Does not reason sleep in its sea? Where are the *faithful*? The lovers of sacred melody and sacred poetry, the votaries of fashion and conventionalism, the miserable victims of avarice and ambition and selfishness, in pursuit of the “great gain of godliness,” *go to Church*. But amid these “beggary elements,” where do we discover the pure element or the “Godly symptom?” What are our city churches, extraordinary excepted, but theatres and sacred operas in disguise? Are our country churches, with the same exceptions, any thing else than phantasmal synagogues of pride, self-conceit and hypocrisy? Where is the faith of Abraham, the patience of Job, the self-sacrifice of the meek and lowly Jesus to the cause of suffering humanity? Does the pampered Christianity of modern times afford any example of these types? Does not reason reject faith, as demonology and witchcraft, Beelzebub? If men are afflicted, does not common sense teach them a practical remedy, far better than that of Job's comforters? Has not self-culture, self-preservation and self-reliance, supplanted, in the eye of reason and common sense, the exploded ideas of total depravity, vicarious atonement, imputed righteousness, martyrdom and miracles? If, then, the vital spark of Christianity and of Judaism has fled, why attempt to galvan-

ize or embalm the corpse! Why not "lamenting, take a mournful leave," and respectfully, quickly, and if you please, affectionately consign it to that bourne whence no traveller returns? Strewing its grave with the flowers of kind remembrance for this time honored friend of our forefathers, shedding a tear over the departing visions of childhood, let us not weep as those who are without hope, but console and reanimate ourselves with the joyful reflection, that from the ashes of Faith, Truth springs triumphant on exalting wing, and rises, Phoenix-like, to cheer, to guide and to save.

If the errant and extravagant spirit of Faith, hieing it from its confine, still re-visit the glimpses of the moon, in either of the questionable shapes of spirit of health, or goblin damned—bringing with it airs from Heaven or blasts from Hell, it will be found shunning the day-light of Reason, walking in its winding-sheet, amid the dark superstitions of the Church of Rome, subjected in passive obedience to the powers that be—to infallible authority of pretended divine inspiration, in opposition to the sovereignty of the will of the people—or it wanders among the ruins of the Jewish Synagogue, in the vain expectation of the restoration of Theocracy over the Democracy of Reason. It may occasionally present itself in an abolition convention, or a camp-meeting—or it may perhaps oftener hover over the couch of death, when a bewildered imagination and feverish brain, frightened from its propriety by the approach of the King of Terrors, summons to its aid the early impressions of its childhood. But it shrinks from the sun-light of Truth; at the faintest glimmering of the dawn, at the first shrill crowing of Chanticleer, it hies again to its confine. It not only shrinks from the light of Reason, but even of the dawning intelligence of the Pulpit itself. An enlightened clergy, yielding to the guidance of their flocks, who seek the natural and fresh pasturage of common sense in preference to the spiritual manna of the wilderness, have ceased to urge them up the steep and thorny road to Heaven. The flocks prefer to dally amid the flowery paths and sedgy brooks of enjoyment, and the shepherds follow instead of leading the flocks. Well may Faith hide itself in darkness and moon-shine. Most of the clergy are practically in advance of their theoretical faith—the congregations are in advance of the clergy, and men of intelligence are in advance of both—so that common sense leads and faith follows in the rear, in reversed order of the tactics of the olden time—"On a change tout cela," and we enjoy the feast of reason and the flow of soul.

Metaphysical theology must languish and expire under the operation of any form of government, based like the Constitution of the United States, upon the sovereignty of the people—upon Democracy as opposed to theocracy. The Constitution is emphatically anti-theological, as well as anti-slavery, in all its important principles and provisions. Any attempts to reconcile these repugnant principles must fail. *Vox populi, vox dei*, is the language of the Constitution, and of the sovereign people of these United States. Under the mild operation of the laws tolerating religious belief, the intelligence of the age has gradually eradicated the belief itself, and it is equally vain to attempt to restore the maxim, "*vox dei, vox populi*," as to reconcile the two by submitting to the arbitration of "majorities" or "palpable cases." The Constitution is a fixed fact in *this particular*, and never will or can be amended, for the reason that it is perfect. The more intelligent of the clergy are beginning to understand this, and if the recent agitation shall have tended to enlighten the public mind, lay and clerical, upon this point, it will have served a better purpose than the agitators designed or desired. It is to be hoped that public attention, which has been so unexpectedly awakened to the consideration of this subject, will neither slumber nor sleep until satisfied, from thorough investigation of these grave questions, of the

urgent necessity of a reorganization of our social institutions. Our system of education is glaringly defective, and cannot be amended short of a radical change in regard to the theological pretention of assuming the guardianship of our schools, academies and colleges. Common sense has got possession of the common school fund, and let her defend it with her life; and may the attempt to pervert this sacred fund to sectarian purposes, be met with the "scorn of whigs and jest of tories."

The great obstacle to the immediate reorganization of our Political, Social and Religious institutions upon the basis of Reason and Truth, without regard to preconceived opinion, is the almost universal prevalence of the idea, that religion is the basis of *morals*. Now nothing can be more clearly proved, both from experience as well as a priori, than the utter fallacy of this position—unless it be the truth of the position, that, so far from being the true basis of morals, it is the very reverse, the radical, if not the immediate cause of all immorality. Look about you, and tell me whether you find morality confined to the uninquiring believer? Confined, did I say? Do you not find that those who believe most are the least moral? Look at the savage—the heathen as he is called—does he not believe? Here you see faith in its pristine state of undisputed sway over the mind of man; and as you proceed in your inquiry, among the nations of the earth, mark how wonderfully man rises to moral excellence, in exact proportion to the emancipation of the reason from the dominion of faith. Coming down to our own times, compare the present civilized nations with each other; and particularly scrutinize the people of our own beloved country. Is faith the parent of virtue, or is it reason, which opposes faith as its natural enemy? Reason is the only safe basis of morals; and all experience, all observation confirms the truth that knowledge, and reason, and not faith, are the source of all the morality extant. That just in proportion to the exercise of the reasoning faculty of man, is his power over the animal passions of his nature, as well as over his imagination. Religious belief, as it is vaguely called, is falsely and impudently claimed by all who entertain it, in a greater or less degree, as the test of moral character—nothing is more unfounded in fact or in reason. We see men immoral, in the church and out of it—and why? because morals are taught in the church and out of it; and because men are naturally more or less under the influence of their animal passions, in the church and out of it. The Bible contains much of sound moral philosophy mixed up with its metaphysical theology. Hence people who frequent our churches, which are orderly, and moral institutions in their design and effect, are moral as a general rule. But it is not in proportion to their *faith*, that they are moral. Faith has nothing to do with morals—faith teaches duty to God—morals duty to man. The one requires prayer, and praise; and above all, it requires prayer for faith; for without faith there would be no prayer, and without prayer there is not much faith. "By faith are ye saved" is the maxim of the popular religion of the day. Saved from what? "Eternal wo in a burning lake of fire and brimstone, where shall be weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth." O tempora! O Mores! By morals man learns his duty to himself and to his neighbor. Now I ask, who in point of fact does best discharge these duties? Is it the devotee, the bigot, the fanatic? or is it the rational believer? Surely the latter. Rational belief is then more moral than blind faith? O yes! Faith then in its pure state is not so moral as when mixed with a due proportion of reason? No. Why not then improve the compound by rejecting all faith? Why adulterate reason with faith? Does not reason teach us our duty to man and to ourselves? Does it not teach us to love one another and not to hate—to honor our parents, not to kill, not to lie or steal or covet. Does it not teach us to con-

trol all our animal propensities, and subject them to the law of reason; and is not this morality? What need that these plain deductions of reason, which the child learns long before it pretends to know any thing about theology, should be revealed to us from a burning bush and written on tables of stone? They are the plainest and simplest deductions of natural reason; and most of the so called heathen nations learn and practice them without thanks to the missionary societies, for a change of faith. Teach them reason then and not faith.

Were the Indians of America any more moral for being christianised? and if so, was it because of their abstract theological science, or was it from their imitation of the manners and customs of their christian brethren who sold them rum, and endeavored to improve thir physical as well as their spiritual man by the propagation of works as well as of Faith? The history of mankind on every page, contradicts this impudent assumption of the religious world. Even its boasted maxims of "love thy neighbor as thyself," "do to others as ye would that others do to you," are not original. Confucius announced these precepts long before the Christian era. Polygamy is countenanced in both the old and new testaments. Many of the moral sentiments of both systems are either rejected or entirely neglected, as unworthy of the code of civilization, refined by reason and common sense. The plumage of morality, in which modern religion struts, is borrowed from reason.

Now let us look at the reason of this result. Why should religious belief, influence moral conduct? I know of none except it be the belief in the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. Our creeds and catechisms inform us that if we believe, we shall be saved, and if we believe not, we shall be damned: and the natural inference, is, that works are unnecessary—this is the fair inference. But as this seems to be too much for the rational portion of the religious world, they tell us that works must accompany faith. Granted. This is a great advance upon the old creed of "the faithful." And reason is most happy to welcome it, and meet it in the spirit of cordial sympathy. Faith and works then are necessary to salvation. What works?—Duty to God and duty to man. We pray and praise God, and love our neighbor as ourselves, and go to Heaven. Omit these, and we go to Hell. They are both *essentials*—neither will answer alone. Agreed. Now why do we obey this Law? To secure the great reward of Heaven, or to escape the damnation of Hell—in another future and everlasting, unchangeable state. These are the motives addressed to our hopes and fears: and this is the *reason*? why we should both believe and practice the precepts of the Bible, the infallible oracle of the will of God. Is not this a fair statement of popular theology? And this is claimed to be a safer basis of morality than mere human reason. Now I deny this conclusion. I affirm on the contrary, that it is not so safe. Nay more. I insist that it leads inevitably to immorality, and is the radical, if not the immediate, cause of depravity,—and why? Because, experience shews, and we must be ourselves perfectly conscious of the fact, that immediate, present, temporal gratification of animal passion is not, in cases of extraordinary excitement, checked by a regard for any future consequences whatever—let them be ever so fatal, or ever so certain, or ever so immediate. Much less then will they be checked by a more remote and less certain apprehension of punishment. Passion is mere brutality. It does not reason—it does not reflect—hence it is when uncontrolled by reason, equally regardless of all Law, human and divine; and hence we see crime in the faithful as well as in the faithless. But, furthermore, we see that the first obstacle to crime, is the present, temporal punishment. It is the halter and not hell that deters the murderer. If he can escape the halter, he

knows that repentance through faith will open heaven to him at last—hence he dreads the law of man more than that of God. Hence we see that the present reward, has more weight than the future reward—and that present punishment has more influence than future punishment. Hence by removing this faith in the future state, you remove only a secondary or remote obstacle to crime, committed under undue excitement of animal passion—and which we have seen, is not practically any obstacle at all. But this is not all. This faith in a future state of rewards and punishment leads to crime, by the certainty of pardon which it holds out to the culprit, through repentance and faith. And more than all, it tends to immorality, by debauching and enfeebling the understanding and the reason, which are the only controlling powers over passion, by appealing to imagination and blind faith rather than to reason itself.

The fear o' Hell's a hangman's whip
To haud the wretch in order :
But where ye feel your Honor grip,
Let that aye be your border.
Its slightest touches—instant pause—
Debar aside pretences,
And resolutely keep its Laws,
Uncaring consequences.

The Bible contains no basis of morals so safe as this. The reason of man, as a general rule, is more powerful over his passions than fear, of hell or halter. If it fail in its authority, hell and halter are alike forgotten: but of the two, the fear of the halter is greatest—and the fear of hell is nullified by the certainty of pardon through faith and repentance. Hence future punishment not on'y fails to check crime; but on the contrary, the blind faith necessary to its belief, enfeebles reason, which is the only check of passion. And hence a belief in future rewards and punishments tends to immorality.

Aside from this consideration, I know of no influence which faith exercises over morals: and having shewn this to be injurious, I conclude, fairly as I think, that Faith is injurious to morals,—and that the morality of the churches would therefore be improved by increasing knowledge, and gradually diminishing faith: A process which it is satisfactory to know, is going on with more or less rapidity under the progressive growth of Reason and Truth.

The only remaining obstacle I shall notice, which opposes the progressive spirit of the age, is the undue reverence for antiquity. Hoary error is more regarded by the majority of mankind than youthful truth. Men look back with fondness to the precepts of early maternal kindness—to the early impressions of their childhood—when “fancy free” they could indulge without injury, the dreams of imagination, not yet tamed and trained to usefulness by Master Reason, whom it looks upon even in later life, as a very useful old schoolmaster, but as a great bore. How delightful is it to snatch a Holyday hour: to play the truant for a day, to roam at will, and soaring away from the dull plodding routine of this matter-of-fact-world, on the wings of imagination; return to the scenes of our infancy? How hard to give up the delusions of fancy? In hopes of an imaginary heaven, we run the hazard of a million to one against us, of an imaginary eternal hell.

It is an inexplicable mystery, which must be left for time and future discovery to solve, by what means men of honest intentions, and of sound understanding, possessing both the courage to look fact in the face, and the intelligence to reason logically and fairly upon observed fact, can still persist in clinging to their conclusions.

The struggle between Reason and Imagination is deadly. Progressive and retrograde movements joined in mortal combat, have long drenched the

world in blood. Reason has triumphed, in the human race, in the Political, Social and Religious institutions of man, as well as in the individual, and its triumph must continue. The law of progress, like that of water, is "*curret et debet currere.*"

Rejecting imagination, let us, then, cherish the Constitution of the United States of America as a political organization, realizing, and for the first time practically applying to the government of mankind, that sublime social truth, that greatest discovery of Reason, the principle of the progressive nature of the human mind—growing with its growth and strengthening with its strength—gently almost imperceptibly, yet constantly rising from a state of savage infancy and imbecility to a state of civilization and power, the extent of which no eye hath seen, or tongue told, or imagination yet conceived.

The principle of progress in political and social science, like that of Electricity and the expansive power of steam in physical science, was discovered long before it was mechanically applied. The framers of a Constitution for a new world, untrammelled by the stationary and retro-active principles of the Old World, which conflict with the progressive principle of the new, accomplished for political and social science, what Fulton and Morse have done for Physical Science—they realized, they applied, they subjected social and political chaos to law and order, based upon the principle of the gradual, constant, irrepressible and eternal progress of Truth.

The progressive spirit of the Constitution is expressly avowed in the clause which provides for its future amendment. Unlike the laws of the Medes and Persians, which were unalterable, it provides for its own alteration, whenever man, for whom it was made, should, in the progressive spirit of his nature, judge it reasonable and right so to do. Avowing the principle, it provided the ways and means to accomplish its design; it based the Executive and Legislative power of the Government upon the *will of the people*, expressed by means of the Elective Franchise, which will, when it shall have assumed the organization of Law, by being passed through the Legislative and Executive work-shops, is declared to be the "supreme law of the land," and is necessarily exclusive of all "higher power."

Having assisted in framing the Constitution, we pretend to know something about it, and have left in our writings many notes and commentaries, which we respectfully commend to the careful study of the present and rising generation.

At the era of the adoption of the Constitution, there were three contending principles struggling in triangular war for the mastery of the civilized world. The one was the old spiritual Hierarchy, which was the ruling power of man in his infancy, and naturally looked back with complacency upon the days of its past glory and power, which it lost, by being subjected to the military or temporal power—hence the spiritual power was retrograde, retro-active, and repelling; it insisted that man was originally perfect, and had fallen from this state to a state of imperfection. It worshipped the past, and was, in all its sympathies, opposed to the present ruling principle, which had humbled its pride, and enslaved the Church to the State or civil power. The Church, then, was the retrograde, retro-active power, and so remains to this day, as we see fully exemplified in the history of the times.

Opposed to this retro-active principle, was the *State*, or civil authority, ruling by Divine Right, enforcing its will by military brute force. Jealous of the spiritual power, which was always exacting from it the homage of reverence, and passive obedience to its infallible decrees, as well the more substantial homage of the purse—claiming to be the Vicegerent of God upon earth, the inspired interpreter of His law, and sole executor of His will, claiming the power of deposing Kings, of absolving their subjects from all

allegiance to their temporal authority—dissolving the ties of marriage, and above all, holding the keys of Heaven and of Hell. Well might the temporal power strive against it. It had done so for centuries—it had overcome it, but had not and has not yet annihilated it. It is still alive—still struggling, with a force gradually diminishing, as man, through reason, progresses. With the spiritual authority under one foot, subjecting the reason of man, by superstition and an appeal to Divine right—and with the other foot crushing man to the earth with serfdom and slavery of the body, the temporal power of Kings, was supreme—it had nothing more to ask or to hope for—hence it dreaded a return to the past dominion of the spiritual power, and opposed all future changes. It became, therefore, the *stationary power*, opposing both the retro-active and the progressive. In its opposition to the progressive principle, hitherto in its infancy, but fast growing to manhood, it combined with the retro-active as a means of enslaving reason, which is the motive power of progress, thus enslaving the body by temporal power, and the reason by the spiritual authority of the Church, which was still held in check by itself—hence it tolerated the Church so long as it was subservient to the State, and sustained it as a pageant to preach the Divine right of Kings, the temporal and spiritual slavery of man.

“Come! let a proper text be read,
And tick it off with vigor!
How graceless I am laugh at his Dad,
And made Canaan a nigger!”

But reason progresses, mind grows, man drops his swathing bands, grows to boyhood, attains his majority; when he was a child, he thought as a child, he spake as a child, he acted as a child, but now he is a man he putteth away childish things. Cutting loose from the apron strings of Mother Church, and defying the rod of paternal discipline, he assumes the prerogatives of manhood, self-control, freedom, liberty. Without power, without wealth, defeated in every effort to secure a home in the land of his Fathers, he flies to the wilderness of the New World, where he gradually learns to help himself, and finally, in the Constitution of the United States, proclaims to the world his total independence of Church and State, makes himself the source and end of political and ecclesiastical power, and declares the rights of man. “Church and State were made for man—not man for Church and State. *Vox populi, vox dei*. There is no higher power than the Law and the Constitution.” In one word, the principle of progress was established. The stationary principle of *State*, and the retro-active power of the old *Church*, which was the mere menial of the State, were both annihilated by the Constitution. All connection between them was positively forbidden. The will of the people, legally enacted, is the Supreme law, and there is but *one* Supreme. The Elective Franchise, ruling by law, and based upon the will of the people, annihilates the stationary principle of the feudal system, ruling by military power, derived from hereditary Divine right, while the retrograde principle of the Hierarchy, or spiritual power, receives its death warrant in the first amendment of the Constitution which secures freedom to the reason of man. The stationary and retrograde principles, being thus annihilated, the progressive principle which triumphed over both, proceeded, in the plenitude of its Supreme power, to secure its dominion over the destiny of man, by the adoption of the Constitution, as a means, a motive power—a political engine, working upon the progressive principle—a grand social locomotive, capable of conveying in its train, slowly and gradually, (for it is a heavy load) the whole human family—man, woman and child—without regard to name, nation or color, to its glorious land of promise, its final destiny of perfection. Its motion

must necessarily be slow. It may occasionally meet with some of the relics of its old adversaries, Church and State, lying across the track—for the fragments of these old institutions are still extant. The experience of sixty years proves incontestibly that such has been its operation. By the gradual generalization of this principle, mankind have progressed beyond all former example, particularly in the United States, and generally throughout the civilized world. The old world has experienced the shock, and we now witness the death struggle of these contending principles, convulsing it to its center. The result of the combat is certain. Truth is Almighty, and must prevail.

The establishment of this principle of progress, thus securing the emancipation of man from temporal and spiritual bondage, was a giant stride in the onward march of the human race—an advance which struck terror into the hearts of trembling dynasties. It was the hand-writing on the wall, “mene, mene, tekel upharsin,” causing the face of temporal and spiritual tyranny to change with fear. “They could not find out the interpretation of the thing”—they do not understand it yet. With the joints of their loins loosed, and their knees smiting one another, they send for the sooth sayers and interpreters of dreams full of the spirit of knowledge and understanding, but in vain. The dissolvers of hard sentences and doubts “cannot shew the interpretation of the thing.” How shall it be shewn? Who shall expound it? Have ye not a second Daniel? aye, two of them, and are they not Rulers in the Land? and is not the spirit of the Gods in those Daniels, with light and wisdom and excellent understanding? Listen then to the interpretation. Thus saith the Constitution:—

“Ye Kings and Hierarchs of the Earth—holding in temporal and spiritual bondage the sons and daughters of men, before whom all people, and nations, and languages, tremble with fear; slaying whom ye would, and whom ye would keeping alive—setting up whom ye would, and whom ye would putting down—with your hearts lifted up, and your minds hardened with pride, in the name of *Almighty Eternal Truth*, ye are deposed! and your glory is taken from you! Know ye that truth and reason shall hereafter govern the children of men, and that they will appoint to rule over them whomsoever they will. The progress of truth and reason has numbered your Kingdoms and finished them; ye are weighed in the balance and found wanting. Your Kingdoms of error are divided and given over to the dominion of Truth and Reason, which is gathering all the nations of the Earth to itself. Truth must prevail. Before its triumphant car, working upon the principle of gradual but irresistible progress, as the fundamental law of the organic constitution of man, Kings and Hierarchies, Lords temporal and Lords spiritual, must clear the track, or be crushed and ground to powder. Leaving the things which are behind, and pressing forward to the prize of his high calling, man, under free institutions, takes up the line of march. Adopting the Eagle as the emblem of his destiny, soaring high above the ken of mortal eye, with union, as an indispensable adjunct, inscribed upon the banner of freedom, he sounds the tocsin of liberty. The alarm resounds from across the Atlantic; France re-echoes the Marseilles Hymn, *marchons! en avant! advance! progress!* and there rises from the civilized world a universal shout from the sons and daughters of temporal and spiritual bondage, crying, Amen! now and forever! one and inseparable!”

This is the interpretation of the thing. Thus say the Daniels—thus saith the spirit of the Constitution. Will you obey its voice, or will you not? Will you advance with the principle of progress and the Constitution, or will you remain stationary, under slavery of the body, to the old feudal military power, or will you retrograde to the dark ages of the infancy

of man, to fanaticism, superstition and spiritual bondage? Will you impede the gradual emancipation of slavery, temporal and spiritual, which was gradually, peaceably, silently going on under the mild yet irresistible influence of the progress of reason and truth, acting by the Constitution, until the progressive movement was checked by the interference of the retroactive relic of northern fanaticism, attacking its old and natural enemy, the relic of the old feudal military slave-holding institutions of the South? which, returning the fire of its ancient adversary, has roused the dying embers—fanned into a flame the spark of the fires of *Smithfield*, transported in the beginning from England to America? Is this old quarrel between Church and State to be fought out in the new world? What says the Constitution? what says common sense and common humanity? what says the true interest of the Church? what says the true interest of slavery itself? The voice of the Constitution is, "Peace, be still, vengeance is mine, I will repay." It bids both these antagonistic principles, in the name of reason, to desist. What is the reply? Do they not immediately combine their forces, in perfect harmony with their natural principles—in harmony with the history of the past? Do they not attack the Constitution, the progressive principle, the natural enemy of both, because the natural and sworn friend and ally of Freedom, temporal and spiritual? Is not this the present actual position of the contending forces of this triangular contest—now converting their plough-shares and pruning hooks into swords? What is to be the result? Your fate is in your own hands. You have the power to slay or to let live: ye can put up whom ye will, and whom ye will ye can put down. Will you fight on the side of Truth and Reason and Freedom, or on the side of Error and Slavery, temporal and spiritual? This same triangular battle was fought at the adoption of the Constitution, when the powers of temporal and spiritual slavery were much stronger than they now are, and when the rights of man, sixty years, are six hundred years younger in the growth of reason than now, triumphed gloriously over both factions. Separately or combined, the Constitution must again triumph over them—by force of reason, if possible, and if not, then by reason of force, for triumph it must, and will, and shall. How will it triumph? Not by a war of extermination, but as it did before, by the destruction of vital principles, leaving outward and visible forms, as lifeless trunks, to stand the "undisturbed monuments of the safety with which error can be tolerated, while truth and reason are left free to combat them." The Constitution did not fell the tree of slavery, nor lop off either branch, but it girdled it—and why? Because in the crash of its fall the Constitution would have been buried beneath its ruins. Like rational men, the framers of the Constitution looked to consequences. They did not mudily condemn expediency. They consulted reason, they conciliated, they reconciled, they compromised, and they triumphed, so ye must consult reason, and conciliate, and be reconciled; ye must compromise, and ye will be saved alive. Let the old trunk stand with both branches—the lifeless branch of slavery at the South—the lifeless, leafless branch of fanaticism at the North—it will soon rot down—it has rotted—it is rotting—it will continue to rot—its roots will decay in time, and then, and not till then, can ye plough them out—meantime, let them continue to rot.

Slavery cannot exist under the present advanced state of civilization; free labor of body, and free thought of mind, is gradually supplanting and eradicating it from the Land. It can no more exist in the presence of freedom, than the uncivilized red man can exist in the presence of civilization. It must vanish like chaff before the wind, like darkness before the light of the sun, which is just dawning upon a benighted, ignorant, miserable world.

Will the immediate emancipationist, and the slave-holder, deign to look at the fact of the red man, and before they madly rush to their fate, involving in their fate (if not checked in their career) all that humanity holds dear? Will they condescend to pause for a moment and consider the story of the uncivilized infant red man of America, who, from their very midst, has vanished, died, and "left no sign?" Where is the red man? Without stopping to answer this question of *where*, reason asks, *why* has he died? Was he not free as the air he breathed? He was no temporal slave; on the contrary, he was a slave-holder. He was superstitious, and hence subject to *spiritual* slavery, but not to bodily slavery. From this notorious and pregnant fact, may not reason fairly conclude, that until man is somewhat advanced in his career of progress—until reason has had an opportunity of subduing the imagination to its control—until man has been instructed in the rudiments of his moral and intellectual education—until he has taken the first steps in human progress, he must remain a savage or a slave? Free labor is the fruit of civilization, slave labor the root. What is the first step in human progress? What is the germ of civilization? Is it not labor? Will the savage man labor? No. Now if labor be the first step of human progress, and if savage man wont labor, how is he to progress? How is infant man to learn to walk? He *must creep first*. Labor is the germ of civilization. Whence the germ? It rose from brute force—from slavery. The savage man, in the first dawn of reason, learned to enslave his captive instead of devouring him. Cannibalism is the normal state of man. He first learned to enslave woman by superior brute force; then he enslaved his captives in war instead of eating them. The woman and the captive *labored* in obedience to their Lord and Master, who scorned labor. Here was the origin of labor—*slavery*. Slave labor was the first step of human progress. Man and woman were compelled by slavery to learn to labor. Savage uncivilized man will not labor, voluntarily, any more than horse or ox. He must be trained to it, and nothing but force will drive him to it. Slave labor, then, is the first step. What next? Labor of body strengthens the body, as the exercise of reason strengthens reason. Both are necessary to labor, to slave labor as well as to free labor. The laboring man then grew by exercising his faculties of body and mind: he progressed, so did the woman, for savage woman is notoriously higher in the scale of being, than savage man. Both progressed until both gradually overcame the idle principle. Man learned from experience that labor was better for him than idleness; he taught this lesson to his children, and they labored, and by degrees man and woman rose from the state of the idle savage, to the industrious and partially civilized state. He ceases to fight and fish and hunt. He plants corn, and builds houses, and gradually advances to a more or less civilized condition. If this be true, and all experience proves it, then where is the immediate emancipationist? I repeat the question, where is the red man? Gone, and why? Because he would not work, and was free to be idle; and where is the slave, whom he compelled to work? He has risen to subdue and eradicate his master. Idleness cannot live in the presence of labor—industry is "death without words" to idleness, and the industrial free-labor class, gradually rising from the germ of slave-labor, has triumphed over slavery, temporal and spiritual, and now, in its commercial, manufacturing and agricultural classes, sways the destiny of the civilized world. Who rules Great Britain? who rules France? who is engaged in its struggle of independence on the continent of Europe? It is the industrial, commercial, manufacturing, working classes—the men of science and of intelligence. The old royal families, the old hierarchies, are defunct, extinct—Robert Peel, the son of a cot-

ton spinner, and Russell and Victor Hugo, and Lamartine—the men of progress, they govern the old world as well as the new.

What then is the lesson of the red man, as applied to the black man? for it is not color, it is reason that distinguishes man from brute, as well as man from man. A white or red man is not, in the eye of reason, naturally superior to a black man, any more than a white or red animal is superior to a black one. The prejudice of color is unworthy of reason. All men are born *in a state of nature*, free and equal, and this is the fair interpretation of my maxim, which has been so shamefully misapplied and misunderstood. Helvetius led me into this error; but Gall and Spurzheim have *progressed*.

Now, compare the black slave race with the free uncivilized red races. Have they disappeared? Have they not increased even faster than their white masters? Do ye not see the reason? Is it not because the black man labors, and because the red man and the white master scorn labor? And will not labor triumph in the long run? will it not continue to eradicate idleness? wilt it not, as heretofore, gradually, but by ceaseless progress, rise to free labor? Can slave labor compete with free labor? No. Slave labor then must give way. It will cease to pay. It has vanished before free labor from the North, the East and the West. It was rapidly disappearing from the South until the insane movement of the retro-active principle of Northern fanaticism checked the action of the progressive principle by calling upon the supernatural Higher Power principle, to aid the natural progressive principle—the consequence of which unnatural pressure must of course produce disaster and detention. The constitutional machinery will bear a moderately high pressure, but Almighty power will destroy the world itself unless guided by reason and certain fixed principles, and invariable laws. Hasten slowly; slow and sure goes a great ways. You have a heavy load to carry—the whole human family are on the move. The Constitution was intended for the Emigrant train, and if you apply the lightning or the thunder, or any such higher power pressure, beware of consequences. Let the black man alone; he is advancing, he labors, he is on the move. The black slave, as a general rule, is in a better condition than the free black, even in this country. He is far in advance of the native African. Look at St. Domingo—look at Jamaica—and will you persist in the dogma of immediate emancipation? Must you not previously educate and train and civilize? Even your European white slaves are not yet prepared for freedom. They struggle to attain physical supremacy, but they are not enlightened in mind; they do not yet fully realize the necessity of free labor, of voluntary restraint, of self-control, and hence they remain subjected to masters. They are on the move, but they must creep before they can walk. The people of the United States are far in advance of all the nations of the earth, in their political system, and it is in vain that you would expect the black man, or any uncivilized race, to wield its destiny. You might as well expect from childhood the wisdom of manhood. If religion and humanity presses too hard upon the safety valve, let off the surplus steam upon spiritual slavery and erratic politics at the North. It will take fifty years at least to abolish this bondage. Preach reason and truth and common sense, and temporal slavery at the South will disappear with spiritual slavery at the North. Reform the Pulpit, reform the Senate.

In all branches of practical business, there are cases in which an individual is bound to conform his practice to a pre-established rule, while there are others, in which it is part of his task to find or construct the rule by which he is to govern his conduct. The first, for example, is the case of a Judge, under a definite written code. Here the Judge is not called upon to decide what course would be intrinsically the most advisable in the particular case

in hand, but only within what rule of law it falls. Now, in contrast with the situation of a Judge, suppose the case of a Legislator. As the Judge has laws for his guidance, the Legislator has rules and maxims of policy. But it would be a manifest error to suppose that the Legislator is bound by these maxims in the same manner the Judge is bound by the laws. The Legislator is bound to consider the reason or grounds of the maxim—the Judge has nothing to do with those of the law, except so far as a consideration of them may throw light upon the intention of the law-maker, where his words have left it doubtful. To the Judge the rule once positively ascertained is final; but the Legislator, or other practitioner, who goes by rules rather than by their reasons, like the old fashioned German tacticians, who were vanquished by Napoleon, or the physician, who preferred that his patients should die by rule, rather than recover by it, is rightly judged to be a mere pedant, and the slave of his formulas.

In the complicated affairs of life, and still more in those of states and societies, rules cannot be relied on without constantly referring back to the scientific laws on which they are founded. By a wise practitioner, therefore, rules of conduct will only be considered as provisional, and not as superseding the necessity of going through (when circumstance require) the process requisite for framing a rule, from the data of the particular case before us. The error is therefore apparent, of those who would deduce the line of conduct proper to particular cases, from supposed universal practical maxims, overlooking the necessity of constantly referring back to first principles in order to be sure of attaining even the specific end which the rules have in view. How much greater still then must be the error of setting up such unbending principles, not merely as universal rules for attaining a given end, but as rules of conduct generally, without regard to the possibility that success itself may conflict with some other end, which may be more desirable. This is the habitual error of the politicians of your day, an error which has brought much discredit upon them in the estimation of sound thinkers and physicians. The common-places of politics, are large and sweeping practical maxims, from which men reason down to particular applications. This they call being logical and consistent. For instance, the maxim "Love thy neighbor as thyself," is urged to the extent of rescuing a fugitive slave under arrest, in conformity with the law of the land, at the hazard of life, liberty and property. Now the error of this position is two fold. First. You extend the maxim far beyond its terms, and defeat its end; you love your neighbor more than you can reasonably love yourself, for it is absurd to suppose that, violent as self-love may be, you can carry it to the extent of sacrificing to it life, liberty and property. This is self-destruction for the sake of self-love; and if you may annihilate yourself, may you not at least allow the annihilation of your neighbor? Do you not involve yourself in the paradox of Paddy, who "meets with his friend, and for love knocks him down?" Second. The maxim requires important limitations and restrictions, instead of unlimited extension. Self-preservation is a law of our nature, second to none, not even to that of "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and must limit, if it does not justly and practically annihilate the maxim itself. Who *practically* "loves his neighbor as himself? Who can do so? This boasted maxim will not bear the test of examination; and that ideal perfection, which is so much talked about, but so little practiced, because impracticable, should be placed among the monuments of the safety with which error may be tolerated, &c. But is this an error which can be safely tolerated? Does it not produce an actual deadly conflict? Does it not threaten truth "vi et armis?" and must not truth meet it "vi et armis?" But it may be replied that although the practical application of this principle cannot be defended

by reason, it is enjoined by revelation, and must therefore be obeyed, in defiance of reason. This brings us back to the Higher Power principle, and shews the importance and practical necessity of the preliminary investigation, in regard to the basis of the Higher Power principle. Reason and Revelation are here at swords points. *There can be no compromises*, and the simple question is,

“Under which King, Benzonian?”

Again—in perfect harmony with the above sound and only true and practical method of reasoning, it may be shewn that the attempt to apply the ordinance of 1787, which was framed with sole reference to the extension of slavery into the Northwest Territory, to territory lying in the south and south-western regions of America, is a total perversion of all sound political reasoning, as well as of common sense. The framers of that ordinance, lamenting the existence of slavery, and abhorring its principle in the abstract, concurred with the framers of the Constitution in doing all that could be done, under existing circumstances, to eradicate the evil, by the adoption of means, which were destined slowly but surely to effect their designed ends. Hence the ordinance of 1787—hence the abolition of the slave trade, not *immediate*, remember, but prospective—hence the provision in regard to the reclamation of fugitives from service. Such was our antipathy to slavery, that we could not bring ourselves to use the word, lest it should be tortured into a recognition and approval of slavery by the Convention. But when men argue, from this, that we designed or intended to regulate slavery by direct interference of the Constitution, they err fundamentally. We left that question for the States to settle, each one for itself. The ordinance of 1787, applying, as it does, solely to the Northwest Territory, merely operates as a declaration of the existing hostility to slavery, where it did not exist, and where, from the nature of things, it was manifest slavery never could exist, whether tolerated or prohibited. The ordinance hath this extent, and no more. To infer from this ordinance that we would equally have applied the principle to the South and Southwest Territory, had any such then existed, is a great mistake. There is no analogy in the circumstances of these totally different cases. Let us examine this point for a moment.

Here are your millions of slaves—your State institutions legalizing slavery—and your Federal Constitution silently but essentially opposed to slavery as antagonistic in principle to the rights of man. The north-west regions of your vast empire are, by nature of soil, as well as of moral principle, hostile to the existence of the negro race. And there is an antipathy of race, equally hostile to the existence of the black man upon terms of political or social equality. In the south and south-western regions, on the contrary, the very reverse of all this is true. Here climate and soil are congenial to the black as well as to the yellow race; and moral causes, combining in wonderful harmony with natural causes, indicate, by unmistakable evidence, that there is the natural home of the black race. In Central and South America the black man, amalgamating and sympathizing with the yellow races, will gradually rise from the degradation of the brute or chattel state, to the dignity of his undoubted and undeniable human nature. “Crossing the breed,” instead of “breeding in and in,” will produce its invariable beneficial result. Both the yellow and the black race will improve; and by a cross between this improved stock and the white race, between which there exists no antipathy, will emanate a mixture, by means of which the black race will gradually disappear. This process cannot take place directly between the white and black races. The difference is too great to admit of cohabitation, except upon demoralizing and degrading terms, equally prejudi-

cial to both races. The mulatto is almost invariably a bastard, an outcast, and consequently without any fault of his, with few acknowledged and highly honorable exceptions, the result of peculiarly favorable circumstances, a vicious, unfortunate, unhappy vagabond upon the face of the earth. How different would be the result if born in honorable wedlock, the issue of a yellow and black cohabitation, this same human being had been bred in a state of society congenial instead of adverse to his natural and moral development? Instead of being a fugitive from the land of his nativity, he would remain at home. Instead of being hunted and driven to starve and freeze in a foreign land, an exile and an outlaw, he would, like the white man, enjoy his existence, and contribute to the general welfare of humanity. Let the black man then go south. Let the planter take him there in the first instance; let him be at the expense of transportation, and let him get paid for his trouble and expense if he can. He ought to be paid for it. Protect the planter in this just claim, and then "*laissez faire*." Depend upon it, the black man will take care of himself. Let him cross with the yellow woman, and the planters will eventually not object to an amalgamation between these improved stocks. All will work together for good. Human nature is human nature! Its lights and shadows will, like kindred drops, soon mingle into one. Here is a natural self-adjusting method of colonization equally beneficial to the white, red and black races. Here is a pass through which slavery is struggling to leave your country. Will you block it? Beware of Thermopylae. Rather pave it with gold, and tempt the retreating enemy to its exodus. Beware of the plagues of Egypt? and send Davy Wilmot to Davy Jones. Let the north then consult its own interest, and identify itself with the interest of the south, and let nature work. Let the black man go to the south, and you will have no more disturbance about Wilmot provisos, or fugitive slave laws, or slavery in any of its appalling aspects. Slavery will gradually disappear from the southern States, as it has from the northern and eastern and western, and free labor will fill the vacuum. If the white free laborer cannot season himself to the climate and soil of the south, the yellow or mixed race can, and the south will eventually import free labor from Central and Southern America, as the north imports free labor from Ireland and Germany. This is the way to untie the Gordian knot of slavery without *cutting*.

And you, ye Southern Sons of Chivalry, ye F. F. V.'s, our kinsmen and friends, pull off those kid gloves, and gradually accustom those delicate fingers to some gentle manipulating process. Picking cotton is a very soft and easy employment. "Don't fret your cattle on the start"—take it easy, keep cool, spike those cannon, save your money. The Constitution will keep an eye upon you. It won't seriously hurt you; perhaps a little discipline may be necessary, but there is no real danger so long as the progressive industrial classes are true to their interests, and stand by the Constitution, as they undoubtedly will.

Mean time keep your temper, and learn to work, not only with your hands, but with your brains. Cultivate your reason, enlarge your understandings, and sober your passions. Mental and bodily labor is all you require. Give up your old feudal notions about stationary power; get upon the locomotive principle, and learn to go ahead as the progressive Yankees do, and have done, until they have left you out of sight. Fire up and put on the steam. Adept the progressive spirit of the age—look forward instead of backwards. "These things if ye do, ye shall do well;" but if you remain where you are, stationary, or retrograde, as many of you are, preaching up the "will of God" to sustain slavery, while the North are preaching up the "Higher Power" to abolish it, you will soon see the hand writing on the wall; you will be deposed, weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Above all things, re-organize your system of education, and endow our University generously. Establish a polytechnic there that will equal the one at Paris. Do this tardy justice to our memory, and your children and children's children will grow up men of practical common sense, which they never will be as long as you send them to play the devil and study theology and metaphysics at the north. Teach them natural science, instead of supernatural science; and then instead of supporting Northern Colleges to preach "Higher Power," Abolitionism, you can send preachers of common sense to eradicate Northern Fanaticism, your deadliest foe. All you lack is a good school where your children may learn common sense. The present generation are hopeless. We foresaw this crisis, but you were behind the times, and there you remain yet. Build up that school and go ahead. Let it be conducted upon the strictly progressive principle. No scholastics, nothing but positive science.

Let the north revise its educational system. Let existing, crumbling institutions be demolished from turret to foundation stone, and upon their ruins re-construct the Temple of Truth. Adopt the Girard principle. The Smithsonian Institute is good. How is Dr. Wayland? Put your shoulders to the wheel. Hercules is dead, and it is in vain to call upon him. Let on the steam, and go ahead. Keep the track of the Constitution; adhere to that for your lives. We know what it cost to obtain it, and you ought to consider, before you attempt to abandon it, that the first element of social union, obedience to a government of any sort, has not been found so easy a thing to establish in the world. Amid a timid and spiritless race, like the inhabitants of the vast plains of tropical countries, passive obedience may be of natural growth, though even there we doubt whether it has ever been found among any people with whom fatalism, or in other words, submission to the pressure of circumstances, as the decree of God, did not prevail as a religious doctrine. But the difficulty of inducing a brave and warlike race to submit their individual will to any common umpire, has always been felt so great, that nothing short of supernatural power, has been deemed adequate to overcome it; and such tribes have always assigned to the first institution of civil society, a divine origin. In modern Europe itself, after the fall of the Roman Empire, to subdue feudal anarchy, and bring the whole people of any European nation into subjection to government, even with the aid of Higher Power Christianity, required thrice as many centuries as have elapsed since that time.

Before you destroy the Constitution you should remember that wherever this habitual submission to law and government has been firmly and durably established, certain pre-requisites and conditions have been fulfilled, of which the following may be considered the principal:

First. There has existed, for all who were accounted citizens, for all who were not slaves, kept down by brute force, a system of *education*, beginning with infancy and continued through life, of which, whatever else it might include, one main and incessant ingredient was *restraining discipline*. To train the human being in the habit, and thence the power of subordinating his personal impulses and aims to what were considered the ends of society—of adhering against all temptation, to the course of conduct which those ends prescribed—of controlling in himself all those feelings which were liable to militate against those ends, and encouraging all such as tended towards them. Whenever this discipline or self-restraint becomes relaxed, anarchy ensues, and the nation becomes either the slave of despotism, or the prey of a foreign invader.

The second condition of permanent political society, has been found to be the existence, in some form or other, of the feeling of allegiance or loyalty.

This feeling may vary in its objects, and is not confined to any particular form of government. But whether in a democracy or in a monarchy, its essence is always the same, viz:—That there be *something* in the Constitution, which is *settled* and *unquestionable*, by general consent. This feeling may attach itself, as among the Jews, and other Commonwealths of antiquity, to a common God or Gods, the protectors and guardians of the State. Or it may attach itself to certain persons, who are deemed to be, whether by divine appointment, by long prescription, or by general consent from any cause, the lawful guides and guardians of the rest; or it may attach itself to laws, ancient customs, or even domestic institutions of the State, but there must be *some* fixed point, something which men agreed in holding sacred, and which must not be touched, but held above the reach of discussion. Now the necessity of this feeling may easily be proved; for a State never is, and until mankind are vastly improved, never can be, for any long period, exempt from internal discussion. What then is to enable society to weather the storm? Precisely this,—that however important the interests about which men fall out, the conflict does not affect the fundamental principles of the government, nor threaten large portions of the community with the subversion of that on which they have built their hopes and interests. But when the questioning of these fundamental principles is not only an occasional disease, but habitual and chronic, the State is virtually in a state of civil war, and can never long remain free from it in act and in fact.

The third essential condition, peculiarly worthy of your most solemn attention at this crisis of your political affairs, is a strong and active principle of *nationality*. We need scarcely say that we do not mean a senseless antipathy to foreigners, or a cherishing of absurd peculiarities because they are national, or a refusal to adopt what has been found good by other countries. We mean a principle of sympathy, not of hostility—of union and not of separation. We mean a feeling of common interest among those who live under the same government; we mean that one part of the community shall not consider themselves as foreigners with regard to another part—that they shall cherish the tie which holds them together, shall feel that they are one people, that their lot is cast together, that evil to any of their fellow-countrymen is evil to themselves, and that they cannot selfishly free themselves from their share of any common inconvenience by severing the connexion. This feeling of nationality is the secret of the strength of the old Roman Empire; and in modern times the countries which have had this feeling strongest have been the most powerful, England, France, Holland, Switzerland. While on the other hand, Ireland suffers by its absence towards England, so Italy, Austria and Spain, having lost their nationality, languish. While the completest illustration of the deplorable effects of this want of nationality is afforded by the Republics of South America, where the parts of one and the same State adhere so slightly together, that no sooner does any province think itself aggrieved by the general government, than it proclaims itself a sovereign State. Now it was upon a happy combination of this spirit of nationality, with the vigorous and manly principle of self-independence of the State governments, that the Constitution of the United States was based and agreed to. Let this basis not be disturbed; let the fraternal tie never be sundered. Educate and train your children and children's children to look to it, and to it alone, for safety and happiness.

There is yet a type of Old Dominion, stationary and retrograde slavery existing in the U. S., as well as throughout the civilized world—milder there than elsewhere, yet not extinct. It can be traced directly to the infant state of the race, a relic of barbarism, cherished by the temporal and spiritual tyranny of uncivilized superstitious man. It is sustained by Lords tempo-

cal and Lords spiritual. The law of the land, and the Higher Power law, both enact it, and unite in excluding woman from the post of honor, from all public emolument, from all voice, power or control, in securing either her temporal or eternal welfare. She is not only thus enslaved by positive enactment, but by a power of opinion higher than any law, human or divine, in its operation upon a highly cultivated mind. It excludes her from the most profitable pursuits of labor, from the learned professions, and from the free exercise of her faculties, either of mind or body. But woman has eyes and ears, and above all, she has a tongue, and she has learned how to use them. In perfect harmony with the progressive spirit of the Constitution and of the times, she is beginning to ask troublesome questions. She is not satisfied with being told that submission and passive obedience to the powers that be, are the laws of her nature. She finds herself endowed with a power to reason, more or less perfectly emancipated from a powerful imagination, which she is daily subjecting to its control. Comparing herself with her Lord and Master, ruling by Divine Right, she ventures to question the credentials. She calls St. Paul an old bachelor, who could not, by any possibility, *ex vi termini*, know any thing about the rights of woman, and hence exceeded his powers when he attempted to legislate for woman. They utterly reject the rib story, and think Sarah was no better than she should be, and that Father Abraham was a cowardly old cuckold, fairly entitled to his *horns*.

When woman turns to the Constitution, she finds herself excluded from the Elective Franchise, and from office of trust or emolument—and she asks why is this? why should female slavery be sanctioned? The answer to the question may be found in the fact that woman was not then ready for this immense stride in progress. From a long state of subjection to both temporal and spiritual Lords, she had not advanced as far in the expansion of her reasoning faculty as man. She was too much the creature of imagination; hence the Constitution founded its corner stone upon man as the reasoning power; but this objection is not necessarily permanent, and from the rapid advances she has made and is making, it would be doing violence to reason to conclude that the time may not arrive, when, under the benign influence of education and cultivation of the intellectual faculties, she may not be deemed the equal of man in reason and sound judgment. When that time shall have arrived, then a case may arise, which the Constitution has provided for, which would justify the exercise of the power of amendment. Meantime let woman advance in her career of progress—let her continue to exercise her reasoning faculty. It will grow by culture; it is the fairest flower of Eden; it is not forbidden fruit; let her not be afraid to eat of it, or to share it with man; it is not an apple. Let her increase in knowledge, in science, and having proved her facts, let her not fear to exercise her reason, and trust to it as a guide. Let imagination and its fears be subjected to reason and truth rather than to error consecrated by time, custom, prejudice or interest. Let her beware of Lords temporal and Lords spiritual. Let not man oppose her—let him aid her. Free labor is better than slave labor. Let him first prepare her and then admit her to that legal equality from which he has degraded her by restricting her from the exercise of the only means by which he has left her behind in the march of mind. Give her fair play. Let him not longer insult her understanding by amusing her with the idea of a fancied social supremacy, as a compensation for his legal supremacy. Masks off—away with hypocrisy and cant. Let us advance to honesty and common sense—the twin offspring of Truth and Reason. The social organization must conform to the political organization—they must act in harmony. There is no legal or political equality of sex, and the evil requires

a remedy. The fact is notorious, that savage woman was superior in morals and intelligence to savage man. And why? Because she labored and was industrious, while the man was idle and vicious. Industry is the parent of virtue and intelligence—idleness the parent of vice. Why is not civilized woman equal in stature of body and mind to civilized man? How has civilized man succeeded in rising above her in mental capacity, as well as in bodily strength? It is because he has condemned her to comparative idleness by banishing her from all the higher pursuits of life, which tend to elevate the mind, exercise the reason, and enlarge the understanding, at the same time confining her to domestic drudgery, and excluding her from labor in the open air. Whenever woman can escape from this servitude of mind and body, which forbids her the exercise of her faculties, does she not rise to the level of manhood? Look at the German laboring woman. Is she not equal, nay the superior of non-laboring man? Compare her, body and mind, with idleness of either sex—is she not equal? nay superior? Look now at the doll of civilized man. See her enervated in body and mind—the creature of fancy and imagination—where is her reason? Confined by education and fashion to the merest puerilities—a child, a baby—where is her physical constitution? Cramped, like the Chinese, until she toddles through life, a useless, wretched, miserable thing. Look at laboring woman, the world over, and you see her moral and intelligent, just in proportion to her opportunity of exercise. Let her then be released from the serfdom of idleness, ten times worse than the serfdom of labor—let public law, human and divine, adapt themselves to the progressive spirit of the age, to the wants and demands of truth and reason, and woman and man will rise together, redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation, temporal and spiritual.

Strange times are these we live in, but stranger still are coming. Old opinions, old customs, all old things, are gradually passing away under the progressive principle of the age, and behold all things are becoming new. God speed the movement, and remove all impediments, all stationary or retroactive or erratic principles, tending to retard the progress of man to his destiny. God save the Constitution!

Waft, waft, ye winds, its story,
And you, ye waters, roll,
Till like a sea of glory,
It spreads from pole to pole.
Till o'er our ransomed nature,
Redeemed from Error's chain,
Truth, Supreme Dictator,
O'er all the earth shall reign.

Excuse our doxology. We consider it orthodox.

Resolved, That Life and its attributes, temporal, spiritual and eternal, are sacred trusts, held in subserviency to the eminent domain of absolute Truth: its Lord Paramount, whose we are, and whom alone we serve, in defiance and contempt of political speculators and spiritual metaphysicians, combining their forces, in the vain attempt to harmonise the hostile principles of monarchy and theocracy, with popular ascendancy—endeavoring to reconcile emancipation of mind and body from mental and bodily slavery, with the doctrine of “passive obedience to the divine right of Kings and priestly hierarchies”—the supremacy of the Law of God, with the supremacy of the Law of Man: yet, in fact, establishing two supremes—two masters—God and Man—the Bible, as the will of God—the Constitution as the will of the People. “Consistency thou art a jewel.”

Resolved, That until mankind shall become generally convinced, either by investigation or by instinct, of the existence of “the absolute Truth,”

"The Word" in its various voices, modes, tenses, numbers, persons and genders, such existence and its consequent organic Laws, cannot be assumed as a fundamental legal basis, upon which to construct moral or political Laws, destined to be obligatory upon individuals or communities of mankind, aspiring the dignity of Freedom from Slavery, either in its temporal or spiritual phase. On the contrary, all dogmas upon such existence and its Laws, until so universally generalised among men, as to command universal assent, should remain, in the significant language of Jefferson, "the undisturbed monuments of the safety, with which the wildest theoretical notions may be tolerated in the abstract, so long as common sense is left free to check, control or reject them in the concrete. Meantime while mankind are necessarily compelled, in the absence of the knowledge of the *absolute*, to resort to such *relative* truth or received opinion as a basis of political action as may combine sufficient assent to constitute a political organization, whose inherent energy may prescribe and enforce its will as the law of political conduct, expatriation, anarchy, or annihilation being the inevitable results of any departure from this rule, in its political aspect, they are nevertheless not only free from any such im-erious necessity, compelling them to adopt any uniform code of moral conduct, but on the contrary, rightly reserve to themselves, as individuals, the prerogative of private judgment upon all abstractions of a moral or intellectual nature, as well as the prerogative of freely declaring such judgment, and incorporating it, under just legal limitations, into the supreme law of the land, based upon the will of the people, than which there can be *no higher power*."

Resolved, As a corollary from the foregoing propositions, that we reject, with equal repugnance, "The Higher Power principle," tending, in its practical application to our political institutions, to extend and perpetuate the rapidly expiring existence of a time-worn metaphysical theology, preaching mental and spiritual slavery; and the "Passive Obedience" principle, tending, with equal certainty, to extend and perpetuate the slavery of the body. The confusion of ideas, resulting from the attempt to enforce the maxims of the Bible, as a code of political morality, upon a people who have adopted a written Constitution as the Supreme Political Power, is too obvious in its intellectual aspect, and too lamentable in its practical consequences, to require, at the hands of an abused and insulted community, any consideration, save that of unqualified condemnation. A code of laws, under which slavery, of the most odious type, is justified in one section of the country, and repudiated in another section—a code which arrays whole communities and States, as well as individuals, in hostile collision, and which is, in other particulars, highly exceptionable in its moral and intellectual tendencies, should be furnished with the strongest and most convincing evidence of its super-human pretensions, before it can be admitted as a rule of action, either in politics, or in morals, or in science.

Whereas, The Constitution of the United States combines, in itself, sufficient of relative truth and received opinion, to command the assent of a vast majority of the said States to its provisions, as a basis of common political action.

And whereas, we recognize, in its provisions, principles designed and practically tending to eradicate from our country the relics of slavery, bodily and mental, equally abhorrent to our common human nature.

And whereas, said Constitution, although, in some particulars, not in accordance with our moral sentiments, yet contains within itself a provision for its adaptation to the wants and changing opinions of the community, whenever such wants or opinions shall have become sufficiently generalized to obtain the assent of a majority thereof.

And whereas, said Constitution is, in other particulars, satisfactory to us, establishing, as it does, a Democratic form of government, in opposition to an Aristocracy or Autocracy on the one hand as well as to a Theocratic Hierarchy on the other, therefore,

Resolved, That in the exercise of the prerogative of moral and political free agents, judging each for himself, in his individual capacity, as to the expediency of obeying the law, or suffering the penalty of disobedience, we decide and declare, that while it is inexpedient to attempt, by violence, to oppose the peaceable execution of laws made in pursuance of the said Constitution, we proclaim eternal and uncompromising hostility to the principle of human slavery, either in its temporal or spiritual phase, in whatever form or place it may for a time continue to drag out a lingering existence.

Resolved, That as a means, more effectual than immediate emancipation, to accomplish the end of extinguishing temporal and spiritual slavery, as well as more mild in its operation, both upon the slave and slave-holder, we suggest as a platform, broad as the Union, and co-extensive with our humanity, the immediate adoption of measures, either by our National and State Governments, or by individual enterprise, calculated for the more elevated, as well as more general education of the public mind, without regard to sect, sex, age or color. Let our colleges, academies and common schools, instead of being the vehicles of transmitting to posterity the dogmas of an expiring metaphysical theology, be re-organized upon a basis corresponding with the intelligence and wants of an enlightened and progressive era. And above all, let the National Academy at West Point, and the institution founded by the immortal Jefferson, in Virginia, be elevated to their true position, as leaders in the great work of speeding the progress of humanity to its final glorious destiny. In this National project, let North and South, East and West, combine as a harbinger of peace on earth and good will among men—the only project by which can be realized the idea of man, without regard to color, standing, redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation.

Resolved, That a Committee of seven be appointed, to investigate the question of the influence of the discoveries of modern science upon the evidences of the Holy Scriptures, and that they publish their Report and conclusions, for general information.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to draft a memorial to Congress and the Legislature, upon the subject of schools, &c.





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 802 432 1